

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Applicant appreciatively acknowledges the Examiner's confirmation of receipt of applicants' claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d). Applicant would also appreciate the Examiner's confirmation of receipt of applicants' certified copy of the priority document, which was filed on October 23, 2003, for the German Patent Application 101 11 027.8, filed March 7, 2001 supporting the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119.

Claims 1-4 are now in the application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 5 has been canceled to facilitate prosecution of the instant application.

In "Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102", item 2 on pages 2-3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1 and 4 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,844,416 to Campbell et al. (hereinafter Campbell) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

In "Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103", item 4 on pages 3-4 of the Office Action, claim 2 has been rejected as being obvious

Appl. No. 10/657,602  
Amdt. dated 2/25/05  
Reply to Office action of January 10, 2005

over Campbell in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,404,274 to Hosono et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In "Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103", item 5 on pages 4-5 of the Office Action, claim 3 has been rejected as being obvious over Campbell in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,686,623 to Yamazaki under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 5 has not been rejected.

The rejections have been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. Support for the changes is found in original claim 5 of the instant application.

Applicant appreciatively acknowledges the Examiner's indication in items 6 and 7 of the Office Action Summary that claim 5 is objected to but not rejected. Applicant also notes the Examiner's statement in item 6 on page 5 of the Office action in "Allowable Subject Matter" that certain claimed features (found in claim 5) are not in the prior art and therefore represent allowable subject mater.

Appl. No. 10/657,602  
Amdt. dated 2/25/05  
Reply to Office action of January 10, 2005

In order to facilitate prosecution of the instant application, claim 5 has been canceled and the allowable subject matter thereof has been added to claim 1.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-4 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Any extension fee associated therewith should be charged to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Appl. No. 10/657,602  
Amdt. dated 2/25/05  
Reply to Office action of January 10, 2005

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect  
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner  
and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Laurence A. Greenberg (29,308)

LAG/bb

February 25, 2005

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2480  
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480  
Tel.: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101